

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

APRIL 19, 1966

FOR THE PRESS

NO. 89

CAUTION - FUTURE RELEASE

FOR RELEASE AT 6:30 P.M., E.S.T., TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1966. NOT TO BE
PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM, OR USED IN ANY WAY.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS
BY THE HONORABLE W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
AMBASSADOR AT LARGE,
BEFORE THE CANADIAN PRESS ANNUAL DINNER
AT ROYAL YORK HOTEL, TORONTO, CANADA
AT 6:30 P.M., E.S.T., TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1966

"It is a high privilege for me to have the opportunity to address this distinguished group of Canadian publishers and editors. Since the Canadian Press serves all Canadian news media, both English-and French-language, I appreciate this unique opportunity for discussing with you some of the problems that face our two countries. In many of these matters we have worked most closely in the past, and I feel deeply that we are destined to continue to do so with increasing understanding over the years to come.

"Of prime importance is the new situation in NATO caused by France's recent unilateral decisions. For somewhat different reasons, both Canada and the United States have strong and emotional ties with France; you, because so many of your citizens are of French origin, and have close family and cultural ties. For our part, the historic and emotional ties with France spring from the crucial assistance given us by France in the difficult days of our Revolution and are still strong in the hearts of our people.

"Thus it is true to say of both our countries that we will never turn aside from the effort to maintain the closest possible collaboration with France. It is significant that the leaders of both our countries have stated our attitude in similar terms.

"Mr. Paul Martin, your distinguished Secretary of State for External Affairs, has expressed the Canadian Government's regret over the French decisions regarding NATO and disagreement with the arguments advanced to justify them. Yet he has stated that the Canadian Government will 'leave the door open for the eventual return of France to full participation in the collective activities of the Alliance should France so desire.' The United States fully agrees with both aspects of Mr. Martin's statement.

"It is heartening that the 14 NATO members joined in the declaration of March 18 expressing the conviction that 'an integrated and interdependent military organization . . . is essential for our security' and that NATO furthers international political and economic progress.

"In past decades the people of Canada and the United States have traveled a long way together. There have been two world wars, in which you Canadians were the first to see our common concern. In the development of the ties of the North Atlantic community in the post-war period, we have joined together in supporting the economic recovery of Europe and our military security through NATO."

.

"NATO is

"NATO is not only still essential for the security of the North Atlantic community, but is a component part of our broad political and economic objectives. At the close of World War II, Stalin hoped, and in fact I believe expected, to take over Europe through popular and united fronts under the existing conditions of economic chaos and with the protection of an overwhelming Soviet military presence in Eastern Europe. Real progress toward his goal was made in developing politically strong Communist parties, particularly in such countries as France and Italy. His plans were thwarted by the Marshall Plan and NATO.

"No one will argue that NATO has not been a vital instrument in protecting Western Europe from Soviet military threat. Although changes within the Soviet Union and its policies have decreased the imminence of this threat, I might point out that these changes of Soviet policy have been influenced by Western solidarity. However, in spite of Soviet protestations of their desire for peaceful coexistence, Soviet policy still supports, on a worldwide basis, Communist subversion and aggression. They have achieved little success through popular and united fronts either in Europe or in the developing countries of the world. The Communists have had setbacks in both Latin America and Africa. Yet their support of so-called 'liberation movements' is as blatant as ever.

"We had a recent reminder of this in the resolutions passed at the Communist-dominated meeting of the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) which met under Castro's chairmanship in Havana in January. This Conference, in which both Soviet and Chinese Communists participated, openly called for 'intensification of all forms of struggle, including the armed struggle of the peoples of the three continents (of Asia, Africa and Latin America) . . . ' and specified by name eight Latin American countries, including Venezuela, Peru and Brazil, as targets in one form or another for 'organized revolution and violence.'

"It is noteworthy that the reaction of the Latin American states to these threats was prompt and categorical. The Organization of American States adopted a resolution February 2 emphatically condemning 'the policy of intervention and aggression of the Communist states and other participating countries and groups manifested in the discussions and decisions' of the Havana Conference. The Uruguayan Government demanded explanations from the Soviet Ambassador in Montevideo for the hostile statements of Soviet Delegate Rashidov, an alternate member of the Presidium of the Communist Party in the USSR. The Soviets disingenuously responded that he attended the Conference 'in an unofficial capacity.' The Permanent Representatives of eighteen Latin American states at the United Nations joined in sending a letter on February 7 of this year to the United Nations Secretary General charging the Conference was a violation of the principle of nonintervention.

"In my talks last July with Chairman Kosygin in Moscow he made clear that Soviet leaders still believe that worldwide Communist revolution is the inevitable course of history. They maintain that attempts to repel Communist-backed liberation movements are destined to failure and, in fact, those who attempt to do so, as for example in Venezuela, are the aggressors."

.

"The

"The most difficult problem today is Viet-Nam. Here Communist terrorist and guerrilla action has taken hold. South Viet-Nam is resisting aggression that is inspired, organized, directed and supplied from the north. The Communists are waging in Viet-Nam the kind of 'people's war' that Marshall Lin Piao, Red China's Defense Minister, maintained last fall was invincible.

"The Government of South Viet-Nam is resisting aggression from the north with the military assistance of Australia, New Zealand, Korea and the United States. Some thirty other countries including Canada are assisting South Viet-Nam in other ways. In Southeast Asia Canada has attempted to play a constructive role as a Member of the ICC.

"President Johnson has made clear that the United States will continue to help the people of South Viet-Nam defend themselves against aggression from the North as long as aggression continues and our help is desired. Our objective is to give the people of South Viet-Nam the opportunity to decide their own future. The President has emphasized that our objectives are limited; that we seek no wider war and are prepared to engage in unconditional negotiations on Viet-Nam with all the countries concerned as soon as the other side shows any desire to seek a peaceful settlement. He has proposed a program of cooperative economic development for the whole of Southeast Asia in which North Viet-Nam could participate.

"In December and January, at President Johnson's request, I visited twelve countries to explain our desire for a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam and to gain help in convincing Hanoi that it should come to the conference table and participate in unconditional negotiations. I found that none of the government leaders with whom I spoke questioned the President's sincerity. Each was willing to be helpful.

"Hanoi and Peiping, however, responded by heaping abuse on the President and terming his efforts a 'hoax,' a 'swindle' and a 'gigantic fraud.' Hanoi reiterated its demand that the Viet Cong must be recognized as the 'sole legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people' before it would agree to negotiations. In other words, Hanoi demanded the surrender of South Viet-Nam before negotiations could even begin.

"While the President's peace initiative did not achieve its objective of preparing the way for a negotiated settlement in Viet-Nam, it did isolate Hanoi and Peiping as the powers blocking the path to peace."

.

"The stability that NATO has brought to Europe is not evident in other parts of the world where collective security measures have been less effective. The threat to our security has diminished in Europe because NATO is there to deter it. But NATO's most enduring accomplishments may be in the future rather than in the past. The settlement of the issues that still divide Eastern Europe and the Atlantic community requires unity of purpose and action as great as that shown by NATO in successfully resisting the threat to our security. As Mr. Paul Martin has so wisely stated: 'It has been of the greatest importance, therefore, that the Atlantic states, through NATO and in other ways, should maintain unity and develop their common interests as a means of

eventually

eventually achieving a broad European settlement with states to the East.'

"The maintenance of an integrated defense is essential to closer and more effective economic collaboration. I still vividly recall discussions that I had with leading European businessmen in the mid-20's in Paris during a meeting of the Council of the International Chamber of Commerce which I attended as a representative of the United States. At that time the American economy was booming and Europe was relatively stagnant with heavy chronic unemployment. In discussing the reasons for this difference, the Europeans maintained that the United States had the great advantage of a continent of free trade. When I asked why action was not taken to break down the barriers in Europe, it was the consensus of European opinion that this could not be done as long as there were individual national military establishments. Each country had to be as autarkic as possible in development and maintenance of industry to supply its military forces. This basic truth was one of the strong motives for the United States encouragement of maximum integration of post-war European defense establishments. There is no doubt in my mind that unless an integrated European force is maintained through NATO, the goals we have all sought for progress toward closer political and economic collaboration in Western Europe will receive a serious setback.

"Thus, I believe NATO is destined to play directly and indirectly an increasingly important role in the development of our common purpose in the North Atlantic community."

* * *